**Course evaluation by course organiser**

To ensure that course evaluations have an effect on teaching quality and the development of the course and to make sure that DIKU’s teaching committee has a good basis for processing the student course evaluations please fill out this form. This is the course organiser´s own evaluation of the course. Please involve other lecturers and teaching assistants as necessary. Please send the evaluation to [vilu@di.ku.dk](mailto:vilu@di.ku.dk). Deadline: one week after reporting the grades in your course.

Find more information about the evaluation procedures here: <https://intranet.ku.dk/diku/teaching/evaluation/Pages/default.aspx>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date | 15/04/2016 |
| Your name | Jon Sporring |
| Course name and number | NDAB15009U  Programmering og problemløsning (PoP) |
| Number of students registered for the exam | 221 |
| Summary, including your comments, of the students’ written evaluations. (The student evaluations are at KUnet under SYSTEMADGANGE > Kursusevaluering SCIENCE (eng. Course evaluation SCIENCE). Prevalent student comments, both negative and positive, should be considered. | A brief summary of A1: The students found that they on average used between 20-35 hours per week, but also that the workload was neither too low nor to high. The students also expressed satisfaction with the content of the course.  A brief summary of A2: Many students expressed great satisfaction with the lectures and exercises, the flow from Scratch, functional, imperative, object oriented programming paradigms, and the progression throughout the course. But particularly the change at exercise 8, which is the first big exercise, was too abrupt. Some voice criticism of using f# as a programming language, some felt that functional programming got too much attention, and some found that the particularly the course did not offer sufficient challenges to the students, who already knew how to program. Finally, some students expressed unhappiness about the book and the lack of online material in general for leaning f#. Finally, some students expressed unhappiness about group assignments and particularly group assignments whose period included holidays.  A brief summary of B: Most students expressed satisfaction with the teachers. Some expressed difficulties in following the lectures, when using live programming, and wished for more slides. Also some students expressed lack in understanding of the relation between the examples given at the lectures and the assignments posed for exercise class.  A brief summary of E1: Most students expressed satisfaction with the coupling between the examination form and the curriculum.  A brief summary of E2: Almost all expressed great satisfaction with the present examination form (running evaluation). |
| Has the oral student evaluation expanded in some fashion upon the written student evaluation. If so, how? | We performed a mid-term oral evaluation on 3 exercise classes. The main conclusion was to focus more on making example code available after class, which was implemented immediately. The importance for the students of this was somewhat repeated in this evaluation. |
| Which adjustments/changes/initiatives, if any, do you propose to address positive and negative student feedback? | In general the course appears to be a great success. 173/221 passed first exam in the combined material of IP and OOPD 2014-2015, which had 149/179 and 100/183 respectively. Thus, at most 100/179 passed both IP and OOPD the passing rate for the combined 15 ECTS at first exam has risen from less than 59% to 78%, and the number of students passing both courses at first exam has risen with at least 73 students corresponding to an 73% increase.  But there are things we clearly can do better: So next year we will focus on the following:   1. Latex was too much of a distraction for some of the simple programming assignments. We will still use the first (Scratch) assignment to introduce Latex, but then take a break until the bigger, later assignments 2. Documentation in f# will be introduced in one of the first week, where we are considering to use code-documentation to replace the current Latex report. 3. The transition from small assignments to report hand-ins will be improved, particularly to smoothen the workload 4. We are on the lookout of improved material. Firstly, we are in a dialogue with the authors of the present book, but also we need to find better material for imperative and object oriented programming in f# |
| Which changes, if any, to the course description will be needed? | None, but we are considering to change the re-examination form to include a programming assignment with short time preparation (1/2 hour) |